arXiv:1009.0109v2 [math.PR] 8 Sep 2011

Characterizations of processes with stationary and independent increments under G-expectation

Yongsheng Song
Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science,
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China;
yssong@amss.ac.cn

Abstract

Our purpose is to investigate properties for processes with stationary and independent increments under G-expectation. As applications, we prove the martingale characterization to G-Brownian motion and present a decomposition theorem for generalized G-Brownian motion.

Key words: stationary increments; independent increments; martingale characterization; decomposition theorem; G-Brownian motion; G-expectation

MSC-classification: 60G10, 60G17, 60G48, 60G51

1 Introduction

Recently, [P06], [P07], [P08a] introduced the notion of G-expectation space, which is a generalization of probability space. As the counterpart of Wiener space in the linear case, the notions of G-Brownian motion, G-martingale, and Itô integral w.r.t. G-Brownian motion were also introduced.

Recall that if $\{A_t\}$ is a continuous process in a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ with stationary, independent increments and finite variation, then there exists some constant c such that $A_t = ct$. However, it's not the case in the G-expectation space $(\Omega_T, L_G^1(\Omega_T), \hat{E})$. A counterexample is $\{\langle B\rangle_t\}$, the quadratic variation process for the coordinate process $\{B_t\}$, which is a G-Brownian motion. We know that $\{\langle B\rangle_t\}$ is a continuous, increasing process with stationary and independent increments, however, it is not a deterministic process.

The process $\{\langle B\rangle_t\}$ is very important in the theory of G-expectation, which shows, in many aspects, the difference between probability space and G-expectation space. For example, we know that in probability space continuous local martingales with finite variation are trivial processes. However, [P07] proved that in G-expectation space all processes in form of $\int_0^t \eta_s d\langle B\rangle_s - \int_0^t 2G(\eta_s)ds$, $\eta \in M_G^1(0,T)$(see Section 2 for the definitions of the function $G(\cdot)$ and the space $M_G^1(0,T)$), are G-martingales with finite variation and continuous paths, which are a class of nontrivial and very interesting processes. [P07] also conjectured that any G-martingale with finite variation should have such representation. Up to now, some properties of the process $\{\langle B\rangle_t\}$ remain unknown. For example, we know that for any $s < t$, $\underline{\sigma}^2(t-s) \leq \langle B\rangle_t - \langle B\rangle_s \leq \overline{\sigma}(t-s)$, but we don't know whether $\{\frac{d}{ds}\langle B\rangle_s\}$ belongs to $M_G^1(0,T)$. This is a very important property since $\{\frac{d}{ds}\langle B\rangle_s\} \in M_G^1(0,T)$ implies that the representation mentioned above of G-martingales with finite variation is not unique.

In probability space, a continuous local martingale $\{M_t\}$ with the quadratic variation process $\langle M\rangle_t = t$ is a standard Brownian motion. However, it's not the case for G-Brownian motion since its quadratic variation process is only an increasing process with stationary and independent increments. How can we give a characterization for G-Brownian motion?

In this article, we shall prove that if $A_t = \int_0^t h_s ds$ (respectively $A_t = \int_0^t h_s d\langle B\rangle_s$) is a process with stationary, independent increments and $h \in M_G^1(0,T)$ (respectively $h \in M_G^{1,+}(0,T)$), there exists some constant c such that $h \equiv c$. As applications, we prove the following conclusions (Question 1 and 3 are put forward by Prof. Shige Peng in private communications):

1. $\{\frac{d}{ds}\langle B\rangle_s\} \notin M_G^1(0,T)$.

2.(Martingale characterization)

A symmetric G-martingale $\{M_t\}$ *is a G-Brownian motion if and only if its quadratic variation process* $\{\langle M\rangle_t\}$ *has stationary and independent increments;*

A symmetric G-martingale $\{M_t\}$ *is a G-Brownian motion if and only if its quadratic variation process* $\langle M\rangle_t = c\langle B\rangle_t$ *for some* $c \geq 0$.

The sufficiency of the second part is implied by that of the first part, but the necessity is not trivial.

3. *Let* $\{X_t\}$ *be a generalized G-Brownian motion with zero mean, then we have the following decomposition:*

$$X_t = M_t + L_t,$$

where $\{M_t\}$ *is a (symmetric) G-Brownian motion, and* $\{L_t\}$ *is a non-positive, non-increasing G-martingale with stationary and independent increments.*

This article is organized as follows: In section 2, we recall some basic notions and results of G-expectation and the related space of random variables. In section 3, we give characterizations to processes with stationary and independent increments. In section 4, as applications, we prove the martingale characterization to G-Brownian motion and present a decomposition theorem for generalized G-Brownian motion. In section 5, we present some properties for G-martingales with finite variation.

2 Preliminary

We recall some basic notions and results of G-expectation and the related space of random variables. More details of this section can be found in [P06, P07, P08a, P08b, P10].

Definition 2.1 Let Ω be a given set and let $\mathcal{H}$ be a vector lattice of real valued functions defined on Ω with $c \in \mathcal{H}$ for all constants c. $\mathcal{H}$ is considered as the space of random variables. A sublinear expectation $\hat{E}$ on $\mathcal{H}$ is a functional $\hat{E} : \mathcal{H} \to R$ satisfying the following properties: For all $X, Y \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

(a) Monotonicity: If $X \geq Y$ then $\hat{E}(X) \geq \hat{E}(Y)$.

(b) Constant preserving: $\hat{E}(c) = c$.

(c) Sub-additivity: $\hat{E}(X) - \hat{E}(Y) \leq \hat{E}(X - Y)$.

(d) Positive homogeneity: $\hat{E}(\lambda X) = \lambda \hat{E}(X)$, $\lambda \geq 0$.

$(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$ is called a sublinear expectation space. □

Definition 2.2 Let X_1 and X_2 be two n-dimensional random vectors defined respectively in sublinear expectation spaces $(\Omega_1, \mathcal{H}_1, \hat{E}_1)$ and $(\Omega_2, \mathcal{H}_2, \hat{E}_2)$. They are called identically distributed, denoted by $X_1 \sim X_2$, if $\hat{E}_1[\varphi(X_1)] = \hat{E}_2[\varphi(X_2)]$, for all $\varphi \in C_{l,Lip}(R^n)$, where $C_{l,Lip}(R^n)$ is the space of real continuous functions defined on R^n such that

$$|\varphi(x) - \varphi(y)| \leq C(1 + |x|^k + |y|^k)|x - y|, \text{for all } x, y \in R^n,$$

where k and C depend only on φ. □

Definition 2.3 In a sublinear expectation space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$ a random vector $Y = (Y_1, \cdots, Y_n)$, $Y_i \in \mathcal{H}$, is said to be independent of another random vector $X = (X_1, \cdots, X_m)$, $X_i \in \mathcal{H}$, under $\hat{E}(\cdot)$, denoted by $Y \perp\!\!\!\perp X$, if for every test function $\varphi \in C_{b,Lip}(R^m \times R^n)$ we have $\hat{E}[\varphi(X, Y)] = \hat{E}[\hat{E}[\varphi(x, Y)]_{x=X}]$. □

Definition 2.4 (G-normal distribution) A d-dimensional random vector $X = (X_1, \cdots, X_d)$ in a sublinear expectation space $(\Omega, \mathcal{H}, \hat{E})$ is called G-normal distributed if for every $a, b \in R_+$ we have

$$aX + b\hat{X} \sim \sqrt{a^2 + b^2}X,$$

where $\hat{X}$ is an independent copy of X. Here the letter G denotes the function

$$G(A) := \frac{1}{2}\hat{E}[(AX, X)] : S_d \to R,$$

where S_d denotes the collection of $d \times d$ symmetric matrices. □

The function $G(\cdot) : S_d \to R$ is a monotonic, sublinear mapping on S_d and $G(A) = \frac{1}{2}\hat{E}[(AX, X)] \leq \frac{1}{2}|A|\hat{E}[|X|^2] =: \frac{1}{2}|A|\bar{\sigma}^2$ implies that there exists a bounded, convex and closed subset $\Gamma \subset S_d^+$ such that

$$G(A) = \frac{1}{2}\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} Tr(\gamma A). \tag{2.0.1}$$

If there exists some $\beta > 0$ such that $G(A) - G(B) \geq \beta Tr(A - B)$ for any $A \geq B$, we call the G-normal distribution non-degenerate. This is the case we consider throughout this article.

Definition 2.5 i) Let $\Omega_T = C_0([0, T]; R^d)$ be endowed with the supremum norm and $\{B_t\}$ be the coordinate process. Set $\mathcal{H}_T^0 := \{\varphi(B_{t_1}, ..., B_{t_n})|n \geq 1, t_1, ..., t_n \in [0, T], \varphi \in C_{l,Lip}(R^{d\times n})\}$. G-expectation is a sublinear expectation defined by

$$\hat{E}[X] = \tilde{E}[\varphi(\sqrt{t_1 - t_0}\xi_1, \cdot\cdot\cdot, \sqrt{t_m - t_{m-1}}\xi_m)],$$

for all $X = \varphi(B_{t_1} - B_{t_0}, B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}, \cdot\cdot\cdot, B_{t_m} - B_{t_{m-1}})$, where $\xi_1, \cdot\cdot\cdot, \xi_n$ are identically distributed d-dimensional G-normally distributed random vectors in a sublinear expectation space $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}, \tilde{E})$ such that ξ_{i+1} is independent of $(\xi_1, \cdot\cdot\cdot, \xi_i)$ for every $i = 1, \cdot\cdot\cdot, m$. $(\Omega_T, \mathcal{H}_T^0, \hat{E})$ is called a G-expectation space.

ii) For $t \in [0, T]$ and $\xi = \varphi(B_{t_1}, ..., B_{t_n}) \in \mathcal{H}_T^0$, the conditional expectation defined by(there is no loss of generality, we assume $t = t_i$)

$$\hat{E}_{t_i}[\varphi(B_{t_1} - B_{t_0}, B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}, \cdot\cdot\cdot, B_{t_m} - B_{t_{m-1}})]$$

$$= \tilde{\varphi}(B_{t_1} - B_{t_0}, B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}, \cdot\cdot\cdot, B_{t_i} - B_{t_{i-1}}),$$

where

$$\tilde{\varphi}(x_1, \cdot\cdot\cdot, x_i) = \hat{E}[\varphi(x_1, \cdot\cdot\cdot, x_i, B_{t_{i+1}} - B_{t_i}, \cdot\cdot\cdot, B_{t_m} - B_{t_{m-1}})].$$

□

Define $||\xi||_{p,G} = [\hat{E}(|\xi|^p)]^{1/p}$ for $\xi \in \mathcal{H}_T^0$ and $p \geq 1$. Then for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\hat{E}_t(\cdot)$ is a continuous mapping on $\mathcal{H}_T^0$ with respect to the norm $|| \cdot ||_{1,G}$ and therefore can be extended continuously to the completion $L_G^1(\Omega_T)$ of $\mathcal{H}_T^0$ under norm $|| \cdot ||_{1,G}$.

Let $L_{ip}(\Omega_T) := \{\varphi(B_{t_1}, ..., B_{t_n}) | n \geq 1, t_1, ..., t_n \in [0, T], \varphi \in C_{b,Lip}(R^{d\times n})\}$, where $C_{b,Lip}(R^{d\times n})$ denotes the set of bounded Lipschitz functions on $R^{d\times n}$. [DHP08] proved that the completions of $C_b(\Omega_T)$, $\mathcal{H}_T^0$ and $L_{ip}(\Omega_T)$ under $\|\cdot\|_{p,G}$ are same and we denote them by $L_G^p(\Omega_T)$.

Definition 2.6 i) We say that $\{X_t\}$ on $(\Omega_T, L_G^1(\Omega_T), \hat{E})$ is a process with independent increments if for any $0 < t < T$ and $s_0 \leq \cdots \leq s_m \leq t \leq t_0 \leq \cdots \leq t_n \leq T$,

$$(X_{t_1} - X_{t_0}, \cdots, X_{t_n} - X_{t_{n-1}}) \perp\!\!\!\perp (X_{s_1} - X_{s_0}, \cdots, X_{s_m} - X_{s_{m-1}}).$$

ii) We say that $\{X_t\}$ on $(\Omega_T, L_G^1(\Omega_T), \hat{E})$ with $X_t \in L_G^1(\Omega_t)$ for every $t \in [0, T]$ is a process with independent increments **w.r.t. the filtration** if for any $0 < s < T$ and $s_0 \leq \cdots \leq s_m \leq s \leq t_0 \leq \cdots \leq t_n \leq T$,

$$(X_{t_1} - X_{t_0}, \cdots, X_{t_n} - X_{t_{n-1}}) \perp\!\!\!\perp (B_{s_1} - B_{s_0}, \cdots, B_{s_m} - B_{s_{m-1}}).$$

□

Remark 2.7 i) Let $\xi \in L_G^1(\Omega_T)$. If there exists $s \in [0, T]$ such that for any $s_0 \leq \cdots \leq s_m \leq s$, $\xi \perp\!\!\!\perp (B_{s_1} - B_{s_0}, \cdots, B_{s_m} - B_{s_{m-1}})$, then we have $\hat{E}_s(\xi) = \hat{E}(\xi)$. In fact, there is no loss of generality, we assume $\xi \geq 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}[\hat{E}_s(\xi) - \hat{E}(\xi)]^2 \\ = \ & \hat{E}[\hat{E}_s(\xi)(\hat{E}_s(\xi) - 2\hat{E}(\xi))] + [\hat{E}(\xi)]^2 \\ = \ & \hat{E}[\hat{E}_s(\xi)(\xi - 2\hat{E}(\xi))] + [\hat{E}(\xi)]^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\xi - 2\hat{E}(\xi) \perp\!\!\!\perp \hat{E}_s(\xi)$, we have

$$\hat{E}[\hat{E}_s(\xi) - \hat{E}(\xi)]^2 = \hat{E}(\xi)(\hat{E}(\xi) - 2\hat{E}(\xi)) + [\hat{E}(\xi)]^2 = 0.$$

ii) Let $\{X_t\}$ on $(\Omega_T, L_G^1(\Omega_T), \hat{E})$ be a process with stationary and independent increments and let $c = \hat{E}(X_T)/T$. If $\hat{E}(X_t) \to 0$ as $t \downarrow 0$, then for any $0 \leq s < t \leq T$, we have $\hat{E}(X_t - X_s) = c(t - s)$.□

Definition 2.8 Let $\{X_t\}$ be a d-dimensional process defined on $(\Omega_T, L_G^1(\Omega_T), \hat{E})$ such that

(i) $X_0 = 0$;

(ii) $\{X_t\}$ is a process with stationary and independent increments w.r.t. the filtration;

(iii) $\lim_{t\to 0} \hat{E}[|X_t|^3]t^{-1} = 0$.

Then $\{X_t\}$ is called a generalized G-Brownian motion.

If in addition $\hat{E}(X_t) = \hat{E}(-X_t) = 0$, $\{X_t\}$ is called a (symmetric) G-Brownian motion. □

Remark 2.9 i) Clearly, the coordinate process $\{B_t\}$ is a (symmetric) G-Brownian motion and its quadratic variation process $\{\langle B\rangle_t\}$ is a process with stationary and independent increments (w.r.t. the filtration).

ii) [P07] gave a characterization for the generalized G-Brownian motion: Let $\{X_t\}$ be a generalized G-Brownian motion. Then

$$X_{t+s} - X_t \sim \sqrt{s}\xi + s\eta \text{ for } t, s \geq 0, \tag{2.0.2}$$

where (ξ, η) is G-distributed(see, e.g., [P08b] for the definition of G-distributed random vectors). In fact, the characterization presented a decomposition of generalized G-Brownian motion in the sense of distribution. In this article, we shall give a pathwise decomposition for the generalized G-Brownian motion. □

Let $H_G^0(0,T)$ be the collection of processes of the following form: for a given partition $\{t_0, \cdots, t_N\} = \pi_T$ of $[0,T]$, $N \geq 1$,

$$\eta_t(\omega) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \xi_j(\omega) 1_{]t_j, t_{j+1}]}(t),$$

where $\xi_i \in L_{ip}(\Omega_{t_i})$, $i = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, N-1$. For every $\eta \in H_G^0(0,T)$, let $\|\eta\|_{H_G^p} = \{\hat{E}(\int_0^T |\eta_s|^2 ds)^{p/2}\}^{1/p}$, $\|\eta\|_{M_G^p} = \{\hat{E}(\int_0^T |\eta_s|^p ds)\}^{1/p}$ and denote by $H_G^p(0,T)$, $M_G^p(0,T)$ the completions of $H_G^0(0,T)$ under the norms $\|\cdot\|_{H_G^p}$, $\|\cdot\|_{M_G^p}$ respectively.

Definition 2.10 For every $\eta \in H_G^0(0,T)$ with the form

$$\eta_t(\omega) = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \xi_j(\omega) 1_{]t_j, t_{j+1}]}(t),$$

we define

$$I(\eta) = \int_0^T \eta(s) dB_s := \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \xi_j (B_{t_{j+1}} - B_{t_j}).$$

By B-D-G inequality(see Proposition 4.3 in [song11a] for this inequality under G-expectation), the mapping $I : H_G^0(0,T) \to L_G^p(\Omega_T)$ is continuous under $\|\cdot\|_{H_G^p}$ and thus can be continuously extended to $H_G^p(0,T)$. □

Definition 2.11 i) A process $\{M_t\}$ with values in $L_G^1(\Omega_T)$ is called a G-martingale if $\hat{E}_s(M_t) = M_s$ for any $s \leq t$. If $\{M_t\}$ and $\{-M_t\}$ are both G-martingales, we call $\{M_t\}$ a symmetric G-martingale.

ii) A random variable $\xi \in L_G^1(\Omega_T)$ is called symmetric, if $\hat{E}(\xi) + \hat{E}(-\xi) = 0$. □

A G-martingale $\{M_t\}$ is symmetric if and only if M_T is symmetric.

Theorem 2.12([DHP08]) There exists a tight subset $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{M}_1(\Omega_T)$ such that

$$\hat{E}(\xi) = \max_{P \in \mathcal{P}} E_P(\xi) \text{ for all } \xi \in \mathcal{H}_T^0.$$

$\mathcal{P}$ is called a set that represents $\hat{E}$.

Remark 2.13 i) Let $(\Omega^0, \mathcal{F}^0, P^0)$ be a probability space and $\{W_t\}$ be a d-dimensional Brownian motion under P^0. Let $F^0 = \{\mathcal{F}_t^0\}$ be the augmented filtration generated by W. [DHP08] proved that

$$\mathcal{P}_M := \{P_h | P_h = P^0 \circ X^{-1}, X_t = \int_0^t h_s dW_s, h \in L^2_{F^0}([0,T]; \Gamma^{1/2})\}$$

is a set that represents $\hat{E}$, where $\Gamma^{1/2} := \{\gamma^{1/2} | \gamma \in \Gamma\}$ and Γ is the set in the representation of $G(\cdot)$ in the formula (2.0.1).

ii) For the 1-dimensional case, i.e., $\Omega_T = C_0([0,T], R^1)$,

$$L^2_{F^0} := L^2_{F^0}([0,T]; \Gamma^{1/2}) = \{h | \ h \text{ is adapted w.r.t. } F^0 \text{ and } \underline{\sigma} \le h_s \le \overline{\sigma}\},$$

where $\overline{\sigma}^2 = \hat{E}(B_1^2)$ and $\underline{\sigma}^2 = -\hat{E}(-B_1^2)$.

$G(a) = 1/2\hat{E}[aB_1^2] = 1/2[\overline{\sigma}^2 a^+ - \underline{\sigma}^2 a^-]$ for $a \in R$.

iii) Set $c(A) = \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_M} P(A)$, for $A \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega_T)$. We say $A \in \mathcal{B}(\Omega_T)$ is a polar set if $c(A) = 0$. If an event happens except on a polar set, we say the event happens q.s..

3 Characterization of processes with stationary and independent increments

In what follows, we only consider the G-expectation space $(\Omega_T, L^1_G(\Omega_T), \hat{E})$ with $\Omega_T = C_0([0,T], R)$ and $\overline{\sigma}^2 = \hat{E}(B_1^2) > -\hat{E}(-B_1^2) = \underline{\sigma}^2 > 0$.

Lemma 3.1 For $\zeta \in M_G^1(0,T)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, let

$$\zeta_t^\varepsilon = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{(t-\varepsilon)^+}^t \zeta_s ds$$

and

$$\zeta_t^{\varepsilon,0} = \sum_{k=1}^{k_\varepsilon - 1} \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \int_{(k-1)\varepsilon}^{k\varepsilon} \zeta_s ds 1_{]k\varepsilon,(k+1)\varepsilon]}(t),$$

where $t \in [0,T]$, $k_\varepsilon \varepsilon \le T < (k_\varepsilon + 1)\varepsilon$. Then as $\varepsilon \to 0$

$$||\zeta^\varepsilon - \zeta||_{M_G^1(0,T)} \to 0 \text{ and } ||\zeta^{\varepsilon,0} - \zeta||_{M_G^1(0,T)} \to 0.$$

Proof. The proofs of the two cases are similar. Here we only prove the second case. Our proof starts with the observation that for any $\zeta, \zeta' \in M_G^1(0,T)$

$$\|\zeta^{\varepsilon,0} - \zeta'^{\varepsilon,0}\|_{M_G^1(0,T)} \leq \|\zeta - \zeta'\|_{M_G^1(0,T)}. \tag{3.0.3}$$

By the definition of space $M_G^1(0,T)$, we know that for every $\zeta \in M_G^1(0,T)$, there exists a sequence of processes $\{\zeta^n\}$ with

$$\zeta_t^n = \Sigma_{k=0}^{m_n-1} \xi_{t_k^n}^n 1_{]t_k^n, t_{k+1}^n]}(t)$$

and $\xi_{t_k^n}^n \in L_{ip}(\Omega_{t_k^n})$ such that

$$\|\zeta - \zeta^n\|_{M_G^1(0,T)} \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty. \tag{3.0.4}$$

It is easily seen that for every n,

$$\|\zeta^{n;\varepsilon,0} - \zeta^n\|_{M_G^1(0,T)} \to 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0. \tag{3.0.5}$$

Thus we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\zeta^{\varepsilon,0} - \zeta\|_{M_G^1(0,T)} \\ \leq\ & \|\zeta^{\varepsilon,0} - \zeta^{n;\varepsilon,0}\|_{M_G^1(0,T)} + \|\zeta^n - \zeta^{n;\varepsilon,0}\|_{M_G^1(0,T)} + \|\zeta^n - \zeta\|_{M_G^1(0,T)} \\ \leq\ & 2\|\zeta^n - \zeta\|_{M_G^1(0,T)} + \|\zeta^n - \zeta^{n;\varepsilon,0}\|_{M_G^1(0,T)}. \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality follows from (3.0.3). Combining (3.0.4) and (3.0.5), first letting $\varepsilon \to 0$, then letting $n \to \infty$, we have

$$\|\zeta^{\varepsilon,0} - \zeta\|_{M_G^1(0,T)} \to 0 \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0.$$

□

Theorem 3.2 Let $A_t = \int_0^t h_s ds$ with $h \in M_G^1(0,T)$ be a process with stationary and independent increments (w.r.t. the filtration). Then we have $h \equiv c$ for some constant c.

Proof. Let $\overline{c} := \hat{E}(A_T)/T \geq -\hat{E}(-A_T)/T =: \underline{c}$. For $n \in N$, set $\varepsilon = T/(2n)$, and define $h^{T/(2n),0}$ as in Lemma 3.1. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|h - h^{T/(2n),0}\|_{M_G^1(0,T)} \\ =\ & \hat{E}[\sum_{k=0}^{2n-1} \int_{kT/(2n)}^{(k+1)T/(2n)} |h_s - h_s^{T/(2n),0}| ds] \\ \geq\ & \hat{E}[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \int_{2kT/(2n)}^{(2k+1)T/(2n)} (h_s - h_s^{T/(2n),0}) ds] \\ =\ & \hat{E}[\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (\int_{2kT/(2n)}^{(2k+1)T/(2n)} h_s ds - \int_{(2k-1)T/(2n)}^{2kT/(2n)} h_s ds)] \\ =\ & \hat{E} \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [(A_{(2k+1)T/2n} - A_{2kT/2n}) - (A_{2kT/2n} - A_{(2k-1)T/2n})]. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, from the condition of independence of the increments and their stationarity,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|h-h^{T/(2n),0}\|_{M_G^1(0,T)} \\ \geq & \sum_{k=1}^{n-1}\hat{E}[(A_{(2k+1)T/2n}-A_{2kT/2n})-(A_{2kT/2n}-A_{(2k-1)T/2n})] \\ = & \sum_{k=1}^{n-1}(\overline{c}-\underline{c})T/(2n) \\ = & (\overline{c}-\underline{c})(n-1)T/(2n). \end{aligned}$$

So by Lemma 3.1, letting $n \to \infty$, we have $\overline{c}=\underline{c}$. Furthermore, we note that $M_t := A_t - \overline{c}t$ is a G-martingale. In fact, for $t > s$, we see

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}_s(M_t) \\ = & \hat{E}_s(M_t - M_s) + M_s \\ = & \hat{E}(M_t - M_s) + M_s \\ = & M_s. \end{aligned}$$

The second equality is due to the independence of increments of M w.r.t. the filtration.

So $\{M_t\}$ is a symmetric G-martingale with finite variation, from which we conclude that $M_t \equiv 0$, hence that $A_t = \overline{c}t$.□

Corollary 3.3 Assume $\overline{\sigma} > \underline{\sigma} > 0$. Then we have that $\{\frac{d}{ds}\langle B\rangle_s\} \notin M_G^1(0,T)$.

Proof. The proof is straightforward from Theorem 3.2. □

Corollary 3.4 There is no symmetric G-martingale $\{M_t\}$ which is a standard Brownian motion under G-expectation(i.e. $\langle M\rangle_t = t$).

Proof. Let $\{M_t\}$ be a symmetric G-martingale. If $\{M_t\}$ is also a standard Brownian motion, by Theorem 4.8 in [Song11a] or Corollary 5.2 in [Song11b], there exists $\{h_s\} \in M_G^2(0,T)$ such that

$$M_t = \int_0^t h_s dB_s$$

and

$$\int_0^t h_s^2 d\langle B\rangle_s = t.$$

Thus we have $\frac{d}{ds}\langle B\rangle_s = h_s^{-2} \in M_G^1(0,T)$, which contradicts the conclusion of Corollary 3.3. □

Proposition 3.5 Let $A_t = \int_0^t h_s ds$ with $h \in M_G^1(0,T)$ be a process with independent increments. Then A_t is symmetric for every $t \in [0,T]$.

Proof. By arguments similar to that in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & ||h - h^{T/(2n),0}||_{M_G^1(0,T)} \\ \geq \ & \hat{E}\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}[(A_{(2k+1)T/2n} - A_{2kT/2n}) - (A_{2kT/2n} - A_{(2k-1)^+T/2n})] \\ = \ & \sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\{\hat{E}(A_{(2k+1)T/2n} - A_{2kT/2n}) + \hat{E}[-(A_{2kT/2n} - A_{(2k-1)^+T/2n})]\}. \end{aligned}$$

The right side of the first inequality is only the sum of the odd terms. Summing up the even terms only, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & ||h - h^{T/(2n),0}||_{M_G^1(0,T)} \\ \geq \ & \sum_{k=0}^{n-1}\{\hat{E}(A_{(2k+2)T/2n} - A_{(2k+1)T/2n}) + \hat{E}[-(A_{(2k+1)T/2n} - A_{2kT/2n})]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above inequalities, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 2||h - h^{T/(2n),0}||_{M_G^1(0,T)} \\ \geq \ & \sum_{k=0}^{2n-1}\{\hat{E}(A_{(k+1)T/2n} - A_{(kT/2n)}) + \hat{E}[-(A_{(k+1)T/2n} - A_{kT/2n})]\} \\ \geq \ & \hat{E}\sum_{k=0}^{2n-1}(A_{(k+1)T/2n} - A_{(kT/2n)}) + \hat{E}\sum_{k=0}^{2n-1}[-(A_{(k+1)T/2n} - A_{kT/2n})] \\ = \ & \hat{E}(A_T) + \hat{E}(-A_T). \end{aligned}$$

Thus by Lemma 3.1, letting $n \to \infty$, we have $\hat{E}(A_T) + \hat{E}(-A_T) = 0$, which means that A_T is symmetric. □

For $n \in N$, define $\delta_n(s)$ in the following way:

$$\delta_n(s) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}(-1)^i 1_{]\frac{iT}{n},\frac{(i+1)T}{n}]}(s), \text{ for all } s \in [0,T].$$

In [Song10c] we proved that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\hat{E}(\int_0^T \delta_n(s)h_s ds) = 0$ for $h \in M_G^1(0,T)$.

Let $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma\{B_s | s \leq t\}$ and $\mathbb{F} = \{\mathcal{F}_t\}_{t\in[0,T]}$.

In the following, we shall use some notations introduced in Remark 2.13.

For every $P \in \mathcal{P}_M$ and $t \in [0,T]$, set $\mathcal{A}_{t,P} := \{Q \in \mathcal{P}_M | \ Q_{|\mathcal{F}_t} = P_{|\mathcal{F}_t}\}$. Proposition 3.4 in [STZ11] gave the following result: For $t \in [0,T]$, assume $\xi \in L_G^1(\Omega_T)$ and $\eta \in L_G^1(\Omega_t)$. Then $\eta = \hat{E}_t(\xi)$ if and only if for every $P \in \mathcal{P}_M$

$$\eta = \operatorname{ess\,sup}^P_{Q\in\mathcal{A}_{t,P}} E_Q(\xi|\mathcal{F}_t), \ P\text{-}a.s.,$$

where $\operatorname{ess\,sup}^P$ denotes the essential supremum under P.

Theorem 3.6 Let $A_t = \int_0^t h_s d\langle B\rangle_s$ be a process with stationary, independent increments (w.r.t. the filtration) and $h \in M_G^{\beta,+}(0,T)$ for some $\beta > 1$. Then there exists a constant $c \geq 0$ such that $A_t = c\langle B\rangle_t$.

Proof. For the readability, we divide the proof into several steps:

Step 1. Set $K_t := \int_0^t h_s ds$. We claim that K_T is symmetric.

Step 1.1. Let $\overline{\mu} = \hat{E}(A_T)/T$ and $\underline{\mu} = -\hat{E}(-A_T)/T$. First, we shall prove that $\frac{\overline{\mu}}{\overline{\sigma}^2} = \frac{\underline{\mu}}{\underline{\sigma}^2}$.

Actually, for any $0 \leq s < t \leq T$, we have

$$\hat{E}_s(\int_s^t h_r dr) = \hat{E}_s(\int_s^t \theta_r^{-1} dA_r) \geq \frac{1}{\overline{\sigma}^2}\hat{E}_s(\int_s^t dA_r) = \frac{\overline{\mu}}{\overline{\sigma}^2}(t-s) \quad q.s.,$$

where the inequality holds due to $\theta_s \leq \overline{\sigma}^2$, q.s.. Since $h \in M_G^\beta(\Omega_T)$, we have $A_T \in L_G^\beta(\Omega_T)$. Noting that $\underline{\mu}t - A_t$ is nonincreasing by Lemma 4.3 in Section 4 since it is a G-martingale with finite variation, we have, for every $\eta \in L^2_{F^0}$, P_η-a.s.,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\hat{E}_s(\int_s^t h_r dr) \\
= \ & \operatorname{ess\,sup}^{P_\eta}_{Q\in\mathcal{A}_{t,P_\eta}} E_Q(\int_s^t h_r dr|\mathcal{F}_s) \\
= \ & \operatorname{ess\,sup}^{P_\eta}_{Q\in\mathcal{A}_{t,P_\eta}} E_Q(\int_s^t \theta_r^{-1} dA_r|\mathcal{F}_s) \\
\geq \ & \underline{\mu} \operatorname{ess\,sup}^{P_\eta}_{Q\in\mathcal{A}_{t,P_\eta}} E_Q(\int_s^t \theta_r^{-1} dr|\mathcal{F}_s) \\
= \ & \frac{\underline{\mu}}{\underline{\sigma}^2}(t-s).
\end{aligned}$$

So

$$\hat{E}_s(\int_s^t h_r dr) \geq \max\{\frac{\overline{\mu}}{\overline{\sigma}^2}, \frac{\underline{\mu}}{\underline{\sigma}^2}\}(t-s) =: \overline{\lambda}(t-s), \ q.s..$$

On the other hand,

$$\hat{E}_s(-\int_s^t h_r dr) = \hat{E}_s(\int_s^t -\theta_r^{-1} dA_r) \geq \frac{1}{\underline{\sigma}^2}\hat{E}_s(-\int_s^t dA_r) = -\frac{\underline{\mu}}{\underline{\sigma}^2}(t-s),\ q.s.$$

and for every $\eta \in L^2_{F^0}$, P_η-a.s.,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{E}_s(-\int_s^t h_r dr) \\
= \ & \operatorname{ess\,sup}^{P_\eta}_{Q \in \mathcal{A}_{t,P_\eta}} E_Q(-\int_s^t h_r dr | \mathcal{F}_s) \\
= \ & \operatorname{ess\,sup}^{P_\eta}_{Q \in \mathcal{A}_{t,P_\eta}} E_Q(-\int_s^t \theta_r^{-1} dA_r | \mathcal{F}_s) \\
\geq \ & \overline{\mu}\ \operatorname{ess\,sup}^{P_\eta}_{Q \in \mathcal{A}_{t,P_\eta}} E_Q(-\int_s^t \theta_r^{-1} dr | \mathcal{F}_s) \\
= \ & -\frac{\overline{\mu}}{\overline{\sigma}^2}(t-s)
\end{aligned}$$

since $A_t - \overline{\mu}t$ is nonincreasing. So

$$\hat{E}_s(-\int_s^t h_r dr) \geq -\min\{\frac{\overline{\mu}}{\overline{\sigma}^2}, \frac{\underline{\mu}}{\underline{\sigma}^2}\}(t-s) =: -\underline{\lambda}(t-s),\ q.s..$$

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \hat{E}(\int_0^T \delta_{2n}(s) h_s ds) \\
= \ & \hat{E}[\int_0^{\frac{(2n-1)T}{2n}} \delta_{2n}(s) h_s ds + \hat{E}_{\frac{(2n-1)T}{2n}}(-\int_{\frac{(2n-1)T}{2n}}^T h_s ds)] \\
\geq \ & (-\underline{\lambda})\frac{T}{2n} + \hat{E}[\int_0^{\frac{(2n-2)T}{2n}} \delta_{2n}(s) h_s ds + \hat{E}_{\frac{(2n-2)T}{2n}}(\int_{\frac{(2n-2)T}{2n}}^{\frac{(2n-1)T}{2n}} h_s ds)] \\
\geq \ & \frac{\overline{\lambda} - \underline{\lambda}}{2n} T + \hat{E}[\int_0^{\frac{(2n-2)T}{2n}} \delta_{2n}(s) h_s ds],
\end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\hat{E}(\int_0^T \delta_{2n}(s) h_s ds) \geq \frac{\overline{\lambda} - \underline{\lambda}}{2} T.$$

So

$$0 = \lim_{n\to\infty} \hat{E}(\int_0^T \delta_{2n}(s) h_s ds) \geq \frac{\overline{\lambda} - \underline{\lambda}}{2} T,$$

and $\frac{\overline{\mu}}{\overline{\sigma}^2} = \frac{\underline{\mu}}{\underline{\sigma}^2} =: \lambda$.

Step 1.2. For every $\eta \in L^2_{F^0}$, $E_{P_\eta}(K_T) = \lambda T$, which implies that K_T is symmetric.

Step 1.2.1. We now introduce some notations: For $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ and $\eta \in L^2_{F^0}$, set $\overline{\eta} = \overline{\sigma}$, $\underline{\eta} = \underline{\sigma}$, $\eta^* = \sqrt{\frac{\overline{\sigma}^2 + \underline{\sigma}^2}{2}}$ on $]s, t]$ and $\overline{\eta} = \underline{\eta} = \eta^* = \eta$ on $]s, t]^c$. For $n \in N$, set $\eta^n_r = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}(\underline{\sigma} 1_{]t_{2i}, t_{2i+1}]}(r) + \overline{\sigma} 1_{]t_{2i+1}, t_{2i+2}]}(r))$ on $]s, t]$ and $\eta^n = \eta$ on $]s, t]^c$, where $t_j = s + \frac{j}{2n}(t - s)$, $j = 0, \cdots, 2n$.

Step 1.2.2. $E_{P_{\eta^n}}(\int_s^t (h_r - \lambda) dr | \mathcal{F}_s) \to 0$, P_η-a.s., as $n \to \infty$.

Actually, we have, P_η-a.s.,

$$\overline{\mu}(t - s) = \hat{E}_s(\int_s^t h_r d\langle B \rangle_r) \geq E_{P_{\overline{\eta}}}(\int_s^t h_r d\langle B \rangle_r | \mathcal{F}_s) = \overline{\sigma}^2 E_{P_{\overline{\eta}}}(\int_s^t h_r dr | \mathcal{F}_s).$$

So

$$E_{P_{\overline{\eta}}}(\int_s^t h_r dr | \mathcal{F}_s) \leq \lambda(t - s), \ P_\eta - a.s.. \tag{3.0.6}$$

By similar arguments we have that

$$E_{P_{\underline{\eta}}}(\int_s^t h_r dr | \mathcal{F}_s) \geq \lambda(t - s), \ P_\eta - a.s.. \tag{3.0.7}$$

Let's compute the following conditional expectations:

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{P_{\eta^n}}(\int_s^t (h_r - \lambda) \delta_{2n}(r) dr | \mathcal{F}_s) \\ = \ & E^{\mathcal{F}_s}_{P_{\eta^n}}[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\{E^{\mathcal{F}_{t_{2i}}}_{P_{\eta^n}} \int_{t_{2i}}^{t_{2i+1}} (h_r - \lambda) dr + E^{\mathcal{F}_{t_{2i+1}}}_{P_{\eta^n}} \int_{t_{2i+1}}^{t_{2i+2}} (\lambda - h_r) dr\}] \\ = \ & : E^{\mathcal{F}_s}_{P_{\eta^n}}[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}(A_i + B_i)], \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_{2n}(r) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1}(1_{]t_{2i}, t_{2i+1}]}(r) - 1_{]t_{2i+1}, t_{2i+2}]}(r))$, $t_j = s + \frac{j}{2n}(t - s)$, $j = 0, \cdots, 2n$, and

$$E_{P_{\eta^n}}(\int_s^t (h_r - \lambda) dr | \mathcal{F}_s) = E^{\mathcal{F}_s}_{P_{\eta^n}}[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}(A_i - B_i)].$$

By (3.0.6) and (3.0.7)(noting that η and s, t are all arbitrary), we conclude that $A_i, B_i \geq 0$, P_{η_n}-a.s.. So

$$|E_{P_{\eta^n}}(\int_s^t (h_r - \lambda) dr | \mathcal{F}_s)| \leq E_{P_{\eta^n}}(\int_s^t (h_r - \lambda) \delta_{2n}(r) dr | \mathcal{F}_s), \ P_\eta - a.s..$$

Noting that

$$E_{P_{\eta^n}}(\int_s^t (h_r-\lambda)\delta_{2n}(r)dr|\mathcal{F}_s) \le \hat{E}_s[\int_s^t (h_r-\lambda)\delta_{2n}(r)dr],\ P_\eta - a.s.$$

and

$$\hat{E}_s[\int_s^t (h_r-\lambda)\delta_{2n}(r)dr] \to 0\ q.s.,\ as\ n\to\infty,$$

we have $E_{P_{\eta^n}}(\int_s^t(h_r-\lambda)dr|\mathcal{F}_s)\to 0$, P_η-a.s., as $n\to\infty$.

Step 1.2.3. For any $\xi\in L_G^1(\Omega_t)$, $E_{P_{\eta^n}}(\xi|\mathcal{F}_s)\to E_{P_{\eta^*}}(\xi|\mathcal{F}_s)$, P_η-a.s., as $n\to\infty$.

In fact, for $\xi=\varphi(B_{s_1}-B_{s_0},\cdots,B_{s_m}-B_{s_{m-1}})\in L_{ip}(\Omega_t)$, the conclusion is obvious. For general $\xi\in L_G^1(\Omega_t)$, there exists a sequence $\{\xi^m\}\subset L_{ip}(\Omega_t)$ such that $\hat{E}[|\xi^m-\xi|]=\hat{E}[\hat{E}_s(|\xi^m-\xi|)]\to 0$. So we can assume $\hat{E}_s(|\xi^m-\xi|)\to 0$ q.s..

Then, P_η-a.s., we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|E_{P_{\eta^n}}(\xi|\mathcal{F}_s)-E_{P_{\eta^*}}(\xi|\mathcal{F}_s)|\\
\le\ &|E_{P_{\eta^n}}(\xi|\mathcal{F}_s)-E_{P_{\eta^n}}(\xi^m|\mathcal{F}_s)|+|E_{P_{\eta^n}}(\xi^m|\mathcal{F}_s)-E_{P_{\eta^*}}(\xi^m|\mathcal{F}_s)|\\
&+|E_{P_{\eta^*}}(\xi^m|\mathcal{F}_s)-E_{P_{\eta^*}}(\xi|\mathcal{F}_s)|\\
\le\ &2\hat{E}_s(|\xi^m-\xi|)+|E_{P_{\eta^n}}(\xi^m|\mathcal{F}_s)-E_{P_{\eta^*}}(\xi^m|\mathcal{F}_s)|.
\end{aligned}$$

First letting $n\to\infty$, then letting $m\to\infty$, we have $E_{P_{\eta^n}}(\xi|\mathcal{F}_s)\to E_{P_{\eta^*}}(\xi|\mathcal{F}_s)$, P_η-a.s.. So combining Step 2.3 and Step 2.4, we have

$$E_{P_{\eta^*}}(\int_s^t h_r dr|\mathcal{F}_s)=\lambda(t-s)\ P_\eta - a.s.. \tag{3.0.8}$$

Step 1.2.4. For $0\le s<t\le T$, $\eta\in L^2_{F^0}$ $\sigma\in[\underline{\sigma},\overline{\sigma}]$, set $\eta^\sigma=\sigma$ on $[s,t]$ and $\eta^\sigma=\eta$ on $[s,t]^c$. We have

$$E_{P_{\eta^\sigma}}(\int_s^t h_r dr|\mathcal{F}_s)=\lambda(t-s)\ P_{\eta^\sigma} - a.s..$$

In fact, Step 1.2.2-Step 1.2.3 proved the following fact: If (3.0.6), (3.0.7) hold for some $\sigma,\sigma'\in[\underline{\sigma},\overline{\sigma}]$, then (3.0.8) holds for $\sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2+\sigma'^2}{2}}$. So by repeating the Step 1.2.2-Step 1.2.3, we get the desired result.

Step 1.2.5. For any simple process $\eta\in L^2_{F^0}$, $E_{P_\eta}(K_T)=\lambda T$.

Let $\eta_r=\sum_{i=0}^{m-1}\eta_{t_i}1_{]t_i,t_{i+1}]}(r)\in L^2_{F^0}$ with $\eta_{t_i}=\sum_{j=1}^{n_i}a_j^i 1_{A_j^i}$ an $\mathcal{F}^0_{t_i}$ measurable simple function, where $\{t_0,\cdots,t_m\}$ is a given partition of $[0,T]$. Set $X_t=\int_0^t\eta_r dW_r$. Let $F^X=\{\mathcal{F}_t^X\}$ be the filtration generated by X.

Fix $0 \le i < m$. Set $\eta_s^{j,\varepsilon} = \eta_s 1_{[0,t_i+\varepsilon]}(s) + a_j^i 1_{]t_i+\varepsilon,T]}(s)$ and $X_t^{j,\varepsilon} = \int_0^t \eta_s^{j,\varepsilon} dW_s$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ small enough. Let $F^{X^{j,\varepsilon}} = \{\mathcal{F}_t^{X^{j,\varepsilon}}\}$ be the filtration generated by $X^{j,\varepsilon}$. Then

$$E_{P_\eta}(\int_{t_i+\varepsilon}^{t_{i+1}} h_r dr) = E_{P^0}(\int_{t_i+\varepsilon}^{t_{i+1}} h_r \circ X dr) = E_{P^0}[E_{P^0}(\int_{t_i+\varepsilon}^{t_{i+1}} h_r \circ X dr|\mathcal{F}_{t_i+\varepsilon}^X)].$$

Since $A_j^i \in \mathcal{F}_{t_i+\varepsilon}^X = \mathcal{F}_{t_i+\varepsilon}^{X^{j,\varepsilon}}$ and $X_t = \sum_{j=0}^{n_i} X_t^{j,\varepsilon} 1_{A_j^i}$ on $[0, t_{i+1}]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& E_{P^0}(\int_{t_i+\varepsilon}^{t_{i+1}} h_r \circ X dr|\mathcal{F}_{t_i+\varepsilon}^X) \\
= & \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} E_{P^0}(1_{A_j^i} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} h_r \circ X^{j,\varepsilon} dr|\mathcal{F}_{t_i+\varepsilon}^X) \\
= & \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} 1_{A_j^i} E_{P^0}(\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} h_r \circ X^{j,\varepsilon} dr|\mathcal{F}_{t_i+\varepsilon}^{X^{j,\varepsilon}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that

$$E_{P^0}(\int_{t_i+\varepsilon}^{t_{i+1}} h_r \circ X^{j,\varepsilon} dr|\mathcal{F}_{t_i+\varepsilon}^{X^{j,\varepsilon}}) = E_{P_{\eta^{j,\varepsilon}}}(\int_{t_i+\varepsilon}^{t_{i+1}} h_r dr|\mathcal{F}_{t_i+\varepsilon}) \circ X^{j,\varepsilon} = \lambda(t_{i+1} - t_i - \varepsilon)\ P^0 - a.s.,$$

by Step 1.2.4, we have $E_{P_\eta}(\int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} h_r dr) = \lambda(t_{i+1} - t_i)$ and $E_{P_\eta}(K_T) = \lambda T$.

Step 2. $h \equiv \lambda$.

Let $M_t = \int_0^t h_r d\langle B\rangle_s - \int_0^t 2G(h_s)ds$ and $N_t = \int_0^t h_s d\langle B\rangle_s - \overline{\mu}t$. As is mentioned in the introduction, [P07] proved that $\{M_t\}$ is a G-martingale. Since $\{\int_0^t h_s d\langle B\rangle_s\}$ is a process with stationary and independent increments w.r.t. the filtration, We know that $\{N_t\}$ is also a G-martingale. Let $L_t = \hat{E}_t(\overline{\mu}T - \overline{\sigma}^2 K_T)$. Then $\{L_t\}$ is a symmetric G-martingale since K_T is symmetric. By the symmetry of $\{L_t\}$ we have

$$M_t = \hat{E}_t(M_T) = \hat{E}_t(L_T + N_T) = L_t + N_t.$$

By uniqueness of the G-martingale decomposition theorem, we get $L \equiv 0$ and $h \equiv \lambda$. □

4 Characterization of the *G*-Brownian motion

A version of the martingale characterization for the G-Brownian motion was given in [XZ09], where only symmetric G-martingales with Markovian property were considered. Here we shall present a martingale characterization in a quite different form, which is a natural but nontrivial generalization of the classical case in a probability space.

Theorem 4.1(Martingale characterization of the G-Brownian motion)

Let $\{M_t\}$ be a symmetric G-martingale with $M_T \in L_G^\alpha(\Omega_T)$ for some $\alpha > 2$ and $\{\langle M\rangle_t\}$ a process with stationary and independent increments (w.r.t. the filtration). Then $\{M_t\}$ is a G-Brownian motion;

Let $\{M_t\}$ be a G-Brownian motion on $(\Omega_T, L_G^1(\Omega_T), \hat{E})$. Then there exists a positive constant c such that $\langle M\rangle_t = c\langle B\rangle_t$.

Proof. By Corollary 5.2 in [Song11b], there exists $h \in M_G^\alpha(0,T)$ such that $M_t = \int_0^t h_s dB_s$. So $\langle M\rangle_t = \int_0^t h_s^2 d\langle B\rangle_s$. By Theorem 3.6, there exists some constant $c \geq 0$ such that $h^2 \equiv c$. Thus by Theorem 2.12 and Remark 2.13, $\{M_t\}$ is a G-Brownian motion with M_t distributed as $N(0, [c^2\underline{\sigma}^2 t, c\overline{\sigma} t])$.

On the other hand, if $\{M_t\}$ is a G-Brownian motion on $(\Omega_T, L_G^1(\Omega_T)$, then $\{M_t\}$ is a symmetric G-martingale. By the above arguments, we have $\langle M\rangle_t = c\langle B\rangle_t$ for some positive constant c. □

Let

$$\mathcal{H} = \{a|\, a(t) = \Sigma_{k=0}^{n-1} a_{t_k} 1_{]t_k, t_{k+1}]}(t), n \in N, 0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_n = T\}$$

and $H = \{a \in \mathcal{H} | \lambda[a = 0] = 0\}$, where λ is the Lebesgue measure.

Lemma 4.2 Let $\{L_t\}$ be a process with absolutely continuous paths. Assume that there exist real numbers $\underline{c} \leq \overline{c}$ such that $\underline{c}(t-s) \leq L_t - L_s \leq \overline{c}(t-s)$ for any $s < t$. Let $C(a) = \overline{c}a^+ - \underline{c}a^-$ for any $a \in R$. If

$$\hat{E}(\int_0^T a(s) dL_s) = \int_0^T C(a(s)) ds, \text{ for all } a \in \mathcal{H},$$

we have that $\{L_t\}$ is a process with stationary and independent increments such that $\underline{c}t = -\hat{E}(-L_t) \leq \hat{E}(L_t) = \overline{c}t$, i.e., its distribution is determined by $\underline{c}, \overline{c}$.

Proof. It suffices to prove the Lemma for the case $\underline{c} < \overline{c}$. For any $a \in H$, let

$$\theta_s^a = \overline{c} 1_{[a(s) \geq 0]} + \underline{c} 1_{[a(s) < 0]}.$$

By assumption,

$$\hat{E}(\int_0^T a(s) dL_s) = \int_0^T a(s) \theta_s^a ds.$$

On the other hand, by Theorem 2.12, there exists some weak compact subset $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{M}_1(\Omega_T)$ such that

$$\hat{E}(\xi) = \max_{P \in \mathcal{P}} E_P(\xi), \text{ for all } \xi \in L_G^1(\Omega_T),$$

which means that there exists $P_a \in \mathcal{P}$ such that

$$E_{P_a}(\int_0^T a(s)dL_s) = \int_0^T a(s)\theta_s^a ds.$$

By the assumption for $\{L_t\}$, we have $P_a\{L_t = \int_0^t \theta_s^a ds, \text{ for all } t \in [0,T]\} = 1$. From this we have

$$\hat{E}[\varphi(L_{t_1} - L_{t_0}, \cdots, L_{t_n} - L_{t_{n-1}})] \geq \varphi(\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \theta_s^a ds, \cdots, \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \theta_s^a ds)$$

for any $\varphi \in C_b(R^n)$ and $n \in N$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}[\varphi(L_{t_1} - L_{t_0}, \cdots, L_{t_n} - L_{t_{n-1}})] \\ \geq & \sup_{a \in H} \varphi(\int_{t_0}^{t_1} \theta_s^a ds, \cdots, \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} \theta_s^a ds) \\ = & \sup_{c_1,\cdots,c_n \in [\underline{c},\overline{c}]} \varphi(c_1(t_1 - t_0), \cdots, c_n(t_n - t_{n-1})). \end{aligned}$$

The converse inequality is obvious. Thus $\{L_t\}$ is a process with stationary and independent increments such that $\underline{c}t = -\hat{E}(-L_t) \leq \hat{E}(L_t) = \overline{c}t$. □

Lemma 4.3 Let $\{L_t\}$ be a G-martingale with finite variation and $L_T \in L_G^\beta(\Omega_T)$ for some $\beta > 1$. Then $\{L_t\}$ is non-increasing. Particularly, $L_t \leq L_0 = \hat{E}(L_T)$.

Proof. By Theorem 4.5 in [Song11a], we know $\{L_t\}$ has the following decomposition

$$L_t = \hat{E}(L_T) + M_t + K_t,$$

where $\{M_t\}$ is a symmetric G-martingale and $\{K_t\}$ is a non-positive, non-increasing G-martingale. Since both $\{L_t\}$ and $\{K_t\}$ are processes with finite variation, we get $M_t \equiv 0$. Therefore, we have $L_t = \hat{E}(L_T) + K_t \leq \hat{E}(L_T) = L_0$. □

Theorem 4.4 Let $\{X_t\}$ be a generalized G-Brownian motion with zero mean. Then we have the following decomposition:

$$X_t = M_t + L_t,$$

where $\{M_t\}$ is a symmetric G-Brownian motion, and $\{L_t\}$ is a non-positive, non-increasing G-martingale with stationary and independent increments.

Proof. Clearly $\{X_t\}$ is a G-martingale. By Theorem 4.5 in [Song11a], we have the following decomposition

$$X_t = M_t + L_t,$$

where $\{M_t\}$ is a symmetric G-martingale, and $\{L_t\}$ is a non-positive, non-increasing G-martingale. Noting that $X_t \in L_G^3(\Omega_T)$ from the definition of generalized G-Brownian motion, we know that $M_t, L_t \in L_G^\beta(\Omega_T)$ for any $1 \leq \beta < 3$ by Theorem 4.5 in [Song11a].

In the sequel, we first prove that $\{L_t\}$ is a process with stationary and independent increments. Noting that $\hat{E}(-L_t) = \hat{E}(-X_t) = ct$ for some positive constant c since $\{X_t\}$ is a process with stationary and independent increments, we claim that $-L_t - ct$ is a G-martingale. To prove this, it suffices to show that for any $t > s$, $\hat{E}_s[-(L_t - L_s)] = c(t-s)$. In fact, since $\{M_t\}$ is a symmetric G-martingale, we have

$$\hat{E}_s[-(L_t - L_s)] = \hat{E}_s[-(X_t - M_t - X_s + M_s)] = \hat{E}_s[-(X_t - X_s)].$$

Noting that $\{X_t\}$ is a process with independent increments(w.r.t. the filtration),

$$\hat{E}_s[-(X_t - X_s)] = \hat{E}[-(X_t - X_s)] = c(t-s).$$

Combining this with Lemma 4.3, we have $-(L_t - L_s) - c(t-s) \leq 0$ for any $s < t$. On the other hand, for any $a \in \mathcal{H}$, noting that $\{M_t\}$ is a symmetric G-martingale, we have

$$\hat{E}[\int_0^T a(s)dL_s] = \hat{E}[\int_0^T a(s)dX_s] = \hat{E}[\Sigma_{k=0}^{n-1} a_{t_k}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})].$$

Since $\{X_t\}$ is a process with stationary, independent increments, we have

$$\begin{array}{ll} & \hat{E}[\int_0^T a(s)dL_s] \\ = & \Sigma_{k=0}^{n-1}\hat{E}[a_{t_k}(X_{t_{k+1}} - X_{t_k})] \\ = & \Sigma_{k=0}^{n-1} c a^-_{t_k}(t_{k+1} - t_k) \\ = & \int_0^T c a^-(s)ds = \int_0^T C(a(s))ds, \end{array}$$

where $C(a(s))$ is defined as in Lemma 4.2 with $\overline{c} = 0, \underline{c} = -c$. By Lemma 4.2, $\{L_t\}$ is a process with stationary and independent increments.

Now we are in a position to show that $\{M_t\}$ is a (symmetric) G-Brownian motion. To this end, by Theorem 4.1, it suffices to prove that $\{\langle M\rangle_t\}$ is a process with stationary and independent increments (w.r.t. the filtration). For $n \in N$, let

$$X_t^n = \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1} X_{\frac{kT}{2^n}} 1_{]\frac{kT}{2^n}, \frac{(k+1)T}{2^n}]}(t)$$

and

$$\Omega_t^n(X) = \sum_{k=0}^{2^n-1}(X_{\frac{(k+1)t}{2^n}} - X_{\frac{kt}{2^n}})^2.$$

Observing that $\Omega_t^n(X) = X_t^2 - 2\int_0^t X_s^n dX_s$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Omega_t^n(X) - \Omega_t^{m+n}(X)| \\ \leq\ & 2(|\int_0^t (X_s^n - X_s^{m+n}) dM_s| + |\int_0^t (X_s^n - X_s^{m+n}) dL_s|) \\ =\ & 2(|I| + |II|). \end{aligned}$$

for any $n, m \in N$. It's easy to check that

$$\hat{E}(|II|) \leq c\int_0^t \hat{E}(|X_s^n - X_s^{m+n}|)ds \to 0 \text{ as } m, n \to \infty.$$

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1}\sum_{j=0}^{2^m-1}(X_{\frac{it}{2^n}+\frac{jt}{2^{n+m}}} - X_{\frac{it}{2^n}})(M_{\frac{it}{2^n}+\frac{(j+1)t}{2^{n+m}}} - M_{\frac{it}{2^n}+\frac{jt}{2^{n+m}}}) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1}\sum_{j=0}^{2^m-1} I_i^j, \end{aligned}$$

we get

$$\hat{E}(I^2) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1}\sum_{j=0}^{2^m-1}\hat{E}[(I_i^j)^2].$$

Let's estimate the expectation $\hat{E}[(I_i^j)^2]$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{E}[(I_i^j)^2] \\ =\ & \hat{E}[(X_{\frac{it}{2^n}+\frac{jt}{2^{n+m}}} - X_{\frac{it}{2^n}})^2(M_{\frac{it}{2^n}+\frac{(j+1)t}{2^{n+m}}} - M_{\frac{it}{2^n}+\frac{jt}{2^{n+m}}})^2] \\ \leq\ & 2\hat{E}[(X_{\frac{it}{2^n}+\frac{jt}{2^{n+m}}} - X_{\frac{it}{2^n}})^2\{(X_{\frac{it}{2^n}+\frac{(j+1)t}{2^{n+m}}} - X_{\frac{it}{2^n}+\frac{jt}{2^{n+m}}})^2 + (L_{\frac{it}{2^n}+\frac{(j+1)t}{2^{n+m}}} - L_{\frac{it}{2^n}+\frac{jt}{2^{n+m}}})^2\}] \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $-c(t-s) \leq L_t - L_s \leq 0$, we have

$$\hat{E}[(I_i^j)^2] \leq \hat{E}[(X_{\frac{it}{2^n}+\frac{jt}{2^{n+m}}} - X_{\frac{it}{2^n}})^2\{(X_{\frac{it}{2^n}+\frac{(j+1)t}{2^{n+m}}} - X_{\frac{it}{2^n}+\frac{jt}{2^{n+m}}})^2 + c^2\frac{t^2}{2^{2(n+m)}}\}].$$

By (2.0.2), $\hat{E}[(X_t - X_s)^2] \leq C_1|t-s|$ for some constant C_1. From the condition of independent increments of X, we have $\hat{E}[(I_i^j)^2] \leq C\frac{j}{2^{2(n+m)}}$ for some constant C, hence that $\hat{E}(I^2) \to 0$, and finally that $\hat{E}(|\Omega_t^n(X) - \Omega_t^{m+n}(X)|) \to 0$ as $m, n \to \infty$. Then

$$\langle X\rangle_t := \lim_{L_G^1(\Omega_T), n\to\infty} \Omega_t^n$$

is a process with stationary and independent increments (w.r.t. the filtration). Noting that $\langle M\rangle_t = \langle X\rangle_t$, $\langle M\rangle_t$ is also a process with stationary and independent increments (w.r.t. the filtration). □

5 G-martingales with finite variation

Proposition 5.1 Let $\eta \in M_G^1(0,T)$ with $|\eta| \equiv c$ for some constant c. Then

$$K_t := \int_0^t \eta_s d\langle B\rangle_s - \int_0^t 2G(\eta_s)ds \tag{5.0.9}$$

is a process with stationary and independent increments. Moreover, for fixed c, all processes in the above form have the same distribution.

Proof. Since $-c(\overline{\sigma}^2 - \underline{\sigma}^2)(t-s) \leq K_t - K_s \leq 0$ for any $s < t$, by Lemma 4.2, it suffices to prove that for any $a \in \mathcal{H}$

$$\hat{E}(\int_0^T a_s dK_s) = \int_0^T C(a_s)ds,$$

where $C(a_s)$ is defined as in Lemma 4.2 with $\overline{c} = 0, \underline{c} = -c(\overline{\sigma}^2 - \underline{\sigma}^2)$. In fact, noting that

$$\int_0^T a_s dK_s \leq \int_0^T 2G(a_s\eta_s)ds - \int_0^T 2a_s G(\eta_s)ds = \int_0^T C(a_s)ds,$$

we have

$$\hat{E}(\int_0^T a_s dK_s) \leq \int_0^T C(a_s)ds.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\hat{E}(\int_0^T a_s dK_s) \geq -\hat{E}\{-[\int_0^T 2G(a_s\eta_s)ds - \int_0^T 2a_s G(\eta_s)ds]\} = \int_0^T C(a_s)ds.$$

So $\{K_t\}$ is a process with stationary and independent increments and its distribution is determined by c. □

Just like the conjecture by Shige Peng for the representation of G-martingales with finite variation, we guess that any G-martingale with stationary, independent increments and finite variation should have the form of (5.0.9). At the end we present a characterization for G-martingales with finite variation.

Proposition 5.2 Let $\{M_t\}$ be a G-martingale with $M_T \in L_G^\beta(\Omega_T)$ for some $\beta > 1$. Then $\{M_t\}$ is a G-martingale with finite variation if and only if $\{f(M_t)\}$ is a G-martingale for any non-decreasing $f \in C_{b,lip}(R)$.

Proof. Necessity. Assume $\{M_t\}$ is a G-martingale with finite variation. By Lemma 4.3, we know that $\{M_t\}$ is non-increasing. By Theorem 5.4 in [Song11b], there exists a sequence $\{\eta_t^n\} \subset H_G^0(0,T)$ such that

$$\hat{E}[\sup_{t\in[0,T]} |M_t - L_t(\eta^n)|^\beta] \to 0$$

as n goes to infinity, where $L_t(\eta^n) = \int_0^t \eta_s^n d\langle B\rangle_s - \int_0^t 2G(\eta_s^n)ds$. It suffices to prove that for any $\eta \in H_G^0(0,T)$ and non-decreasing $f \in C_b^2(R)$, $f(L_t(\eta))$ is a G-martingale. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} f(L_t(\eta)) &= f(L_0) + \int_0^t f'(L_s(\eta))dL_s(\eta) \\ &= f(L_0) + \int_0^t f'(L_s(\eta))\eta_s d\langle B\rangle_s - \int_0^t 2f'(L_s(\eta))G(\eta_s)ds. \end{aligned}$$

Since $f'(L_s(\eta)) \geq 0$ and $f'(L_s(\eta))\eta_s \in M_G^1(0,T)$, we conclude that

$$f(L_t(\eta)) = f(L_0) + L_t(f'(L(\eta))\eta)$$

is a G-martingale.

Sufficiency. Assume $\{f(M_t)\}$ is a G-martingale for any non-decreasing $f \in C_{b,lip}(R)$. Let $X_t := \arctan M_t$. Then $\{X_t\}$ is a bounded G-martingale and $\{f(X_t)\}$ is a G-martingale for any non-decreasing $f \in C_{b,lip}(R)$. By Theorem 4.5 in [Song11a], we know $\{X_t\}$ has the following decomposition

$$X_t = \hat{E}(X_T) + N_t + K_t,$$

where $\{N_t\}$ is a symmetric G-martingale and $\{K_t\}$ is a non-positive, non-increasing G-martingale. Then by Itô's formula

$$e^{\alpha X_t} = e^{\alpha X_0} + \alpha \int_0^t e^{\alpha X_s} dX_s + \frac{\alpha^2}{2} \int_0^t e^{\alpha X_s} d\langle N\rangle_s.$$

For any $\alpha > 0$, by assumption, $e^{\alpha X_t}$ is a G-martingale. So $L_t := \int_0^t e^{\alpha X_s} dK_s + \frac{\alpha}{2}\int_0^t e^{\alpha X_s} d\langle N\rangle_s$ is a G-martingale with finite variation. By Lemma 4.3, L_t is non-increasing, by which we conclude that $K_t + \frac{\alpha}{2}\langle N\rangle_t$ is non-increasing. So

$$\frac{\alpha}{2}\hat{E}(\langle N\rangle_T) \leq \hat{E}(-K_T) \text{ for all } \alpha > 0.$$

By this, we conclude that $\hat{E}(\langle N\rangle_T) = 0$ and $N_t \equiv 0$. Then $X_t = \hat{E}(X_T) + K_t$ is non-increasing, and consequently, M_t is non-increasing. □

Particularly, Proposition 5.2 provides a method to convert G-martingales with finite variation into bounded G-martingales with finite variation.

References

[DHP08] Denis, L., Hu, M. and Peng S. *Function spaces and capacity related to a sublinear expectation: application to G-Brownian motion pathes*. arXiv:0802.1240v1 [math.PR] 9 Feb, 2008

[HP09] Hu, Mingshang and Peng, Shige (2009) *On representation theorem of Gexpectations and paths of G-Brownian motion*. Acta Math Appl Sinica English Series, 25(3): 1-8.

[P06] Peng, S. (2006) *G-expectation, G-Brownian Motion and Related Stochastic Calculus of Itô type*, preprint (pdf-file available in arXiv:math.PR/0601035v1 3Jan 2006), to appear in Proceedings of the 2005 Abel Symposium.

[P08a] Peng, S. (2008) *Multi-Dimensional G-Brownian Motion and Related Stochastic Calculus under G-Expectation*, in Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 118(12), 2223-2253.

[P08b] Peng, S. (2008) *A New Central Limit Theorem under Sublinear Expectations*. arXiv:0803.2656v1 [math.PR] 18 Mar 2008.

[P07] Peng, S. (2007) *G-Brownian Motion and Dynamic Risk Measure under Volatility Uncertainty*, Preprint: arXiv:0711.2834v1 [math.PR] 19 Nov 2007.

[P09] Peng, S. (2009) *Survey on normal distributions, central limit theorem, Brownian motion and the related stochastic calculus under sublinear expectations*, Science in China Series A: Mathematics, 52, No.7, 1391-1411, (www.springerlink.com).

[P10] Peng, S. (2010) *Nonlinear Expectations and Stochastic Calculus under Uncertainty*, arXiv:1002.4546v1 [math.PR] 24 Feb 2010.

[STZ11] Soner M, Touzi N, Zhang J. (2011) *Martingale Representation Theorem under G-expectation.* , Stochastic Processes and their Applications 121, 265C287.

[Song11a] Song, Y.(2011) *Some properties on G-evaluation and its applica- tions to G-martingale decomposition.* Science China Mathematics, Volume 54, Number 2, 287-300.

[Song11b] Song, Y.(2011) *Properties of hitting times for G-martingales and their applicaions.* Stochastic Processes and their Applications 121, 1770C1784.

[Song10] Song, Y.(2010) *Uniqueness of the representation for G-martingales with finite variation. Preprint.*arXiv:1012.1913v2 [math.PR] 31 Dec 2010.

[XZ09] Xu J, Zhang B. (2009) *Martingale characterization of G-Brownian motion.* Stochastic Processes Appl., 119(1): 232-248.